



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/592,563	06/12/2000	Mike Kinsella	KC-040	3714

34610 7590 04/22/2003

FLESHNER & KIM, LLP
P.O. BOX 221200
CHANTILLY, VA 20153

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, LEE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2682

DATE MAILED: 04/22/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/592,563

Applicant(s)

KINSELLA, MIKE



Examiner

LEE NGUYEN

Art Unit

2682

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 18 June 2002 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 3-4.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The IDS filed 6/18/2002, 7/2/2002 has been considered and recorded in the file.

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to because in figure 1 empty boxes should have legends. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-4, 9, 11, 15, 17-19 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by the prior art admitted by Fraccaroli (US 6,549,768).

Regarding claim 1, the admitted prior art of Fraccaroli teaches a message pushing system for sending messages to recipients, the system comprising a database of details of individual potential recipients (col. 1, line 29), inherently including telecommunications links for communicating with message sending and message receiving devices (e-mail, col. 1, line 47), the message pushing system being adapted to receive a message from a message sending means, the message comprising details of the intended recipient of the message, wherein the message pushing system compares the details of the intended recipient of the message with the database of potential recipient's details thereby establishing one or more members who may be the intended recipient, the message pushing system (1) being adapted to transmit said message to the message receiving means of the one or more members who may be the intended recipient (see matching, col. 1, lines 25-52).

Regarding claims 2-3, the admitted prior art of Fraccaroli also teaches that the details of individual potential recipients including their sex,

their hair length and color, their eye color, their age, their height (col. 1, line 32-35).

Regarding claim 4, the admitted prior art of Fraccaroli further teaches including one or more of the e-mail address (col. 1, line 47).

Regarding claims 9, 11, the admitted prior art inherently teaches updating their details (col. 1, lines 32-34, see age, marital status, interests, which can be changed in the future).

Regarding claim 15, the admitted prior art also teaches that one device can function as both a message sending means and a message receiving means (e-mail, col. 1, line 47).

Regarding 17, the admitted prior art also teaches Internet (col. 1, line 46).

Regarding claim 18, the admitted prior art also teaches e-mail (col. 1, line 49).

Regarding claim 19, the admitted prior art also teaches relational database (col. 1, line 27-30).

Regarding claim 22, the admitted prior art also teaches a plurality of message sending and message receiving means, adapted to send

messages to and receive message from the message pushing system (col. 1, lines 34-35).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 5-8, 10, 12-14, 16, 20-21, 23-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the prior art admitted by Fraccaroli in view of Fraccaroli.

Regarding claims 5-6, the admitted prior art fails to teach that the database also includes information about the current location of the recipient. According to Fraccaroli, the database also includes information about the current location of the recipient (col. 10, lines 25-28). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teaching of Fraccaroli to the admitted prior art in order to provide the sender with the most updated information.

Regarding claims 7-8, the admitted prior art as modified also frequently visited locations which including previous locations in the frequently visited locations(col. 10, line 26).

Regarding claim 10, the admitted prior art as modified also teaches updating their details automatically (col. 9, line 66 – col. 10, line 3, location update).

Regarding claim 12, the admitted prior art as modified also teaches allowing messages to be delivered to recipients without the sender of the message knowing the identity of the recipient (col. 2, line 52).

Regarding claims 13-14, the admitted prior art as modified also teaches that the comparison between the details of the potential recipient and member's details on the database does not need to be exact and how close a match between details is required for that message to be sent to that potential recipient (col. 8, lines 43-46).

Regarding claim 16, the admitted prior art as modified also teaches mobile communication (fig. 1, numeral 102). The admitted prior art fails to teach using WAP or I-MODE. It is taken official notice that the art using Wireless Access Protocol in mobile communication is conventionally well known and considered as a standard. It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include WAP to the system of the admitted prior art in order to allow mobile to access to the Web.

Regarding claim 20, the admitted prior art as modified also teaches that the message is transmitted to the recipient or recipients only on request from the recipient or recipients (willingness, col. 2, line 58).

Regarding claim 21, the admitted prior art as modified also teaches that a web site is used to display the message (col. 8, line 52).

Regarding the independent method claim 23, the claim is interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claims 2 and 5.

Regarding claim 24, the claim is interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 2.

Regarding claims 25-26, the claims are interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 3.

Regarding claim 27, the claim is interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 4.

Regarding claims 28-29, the claim is interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claims 5-6.

Regarding claim 30, the claim is interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 7.

Regarding claim 31, the claim is interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 8.

Regarding claim 33, the claim is interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 9.

Regarding claim 34, the claim is interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 10.

Regarding claim 35, the claim is interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 11.

Regarding claim 36, the claim is interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 12.

Regarding claim 37, the claim is interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 13.

Regarding claim 38, the claim is interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 14.

Regarding claim 39, the claim is interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 15.

Regarding claim 40, the claim is interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 16.

Regarding claim 41, the claim is interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 17.

Regarding claim 42, the claim is interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 18.

Regarding claim 43, the claim is interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 19.

Regarding claim 44, the claim is interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 20.

Regarding claim 45, the claim is interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 21.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LEE NGUYEN whose telephone number is (703)-308-5249. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM - 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, VIVIAN CHIN can be reached on (703) 308-6739.

Application/Control Number: 09/592,563
Art Unit: 2682

Page 10

The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9314 for regular communications and (703) 872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-4700.

LEE NGUYEN *Lee* 4/19/03
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2682